REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 23 February 2005. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the combination of elements which form the invention of the subject Patent Application. Additionally, Claims 4 and 6-8 have been amended to correct informalities therein.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Choy, U.S. Patent 6,162,069.

Before discussing the reference relied upon by the Examiner, it is believed beneficial to first briefly review the structure of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed. The invention of the subject Patent Application is directed to an electronic card connector having fixed lateral arms. The connector includes a plastic main body having a base section, with at least one insertion socket being formed on one side of the base section. A front edge of an electronic card can be snuggly inserted into the insertion socket. An upper side and a lower side of the insertion socket are respectively parallelly formed with multiple terminal cavities for inlaying multiple terminals therein. The plastic main body has two lateral arms each having opposing first and second ends and inner and outer sides. The first end of the lateral arms being respectively disposed at two sides of the base section. An electronic card receptacle is defined between the

inner sides of the two lateral arms. A stopper block is disposed on each lateral arm and at least two insertion caves are formed on two ends of the base section. The connector includes resilient members each having a baseboard section and at least one insertion section projecting from a front edge of the baseboard section and respectively inserted in a corresponding insertion cave of the plastic main body adjacent the first end of a respective lateral arm. Each resilient member has a resilient arm extending longitudinally from the base section adjacent the outer side of the respective lateral arm. Each resilient member has a distal end being freely and resiliently displaceable away from the second end of the respective lateral arm when being outwardly biased. Each resilient arm has a stopper board section projecting from a top edge thereof towards the corresponding lateral arm.

In contradistinction, the Choy reference is directed to a rotative installation card edge connector with a grounding device. The reference includes a plastic main body which has a base section 10 having a pair of lateral arms 24 disposed on opposing sides thereof. The reference further includes a metal member 26 which is engaged with the plastic main body by means of a barb section 36. The metal member 26 has a main body 32 which extends longitudinally adjacent the outer side of a respective lateral arm. However, the main body 32 includes an engaging tag 34 for maintaining the metal member 26 "synchronous" with the respective lateral arm 24. Thus, during insertion and removal of an electronic card, the lateral arm 24 is deflected, along with the metal member 26. This is

further defined in Claim 1, for example, wherein the metal member is defined as

having "an engaging tag for synchronizing deflection of the metal member and the

plastic member", column 3, lines 46-49.

Whereas in the invention of the subject Patent Application, the distal end of

each resilient member is freely and resiliently displaceable away from the second

end of the respective lateral arm when being outwardly biased, as now claimed.

By that arrangement, the clearance for insertion and removal of an electronic card

is provided, without subjecting the plastic lateral arms to bending moments, which

would eventually result in their failure. Thus, the structure of the invention of the

subject Patent Application provides a connector capable of a longer lifetime of

operation.

As the reference fails to disclose each and every one of the elements of the

invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed, it cannot anticipate

that invention. While it is believed that the dependent Claims provide further

patentably distinct limitations, those Claims are at least patentably distinct for the

same reasons as Claim 1.

Page 8 of 9

MR1793-135

Serial Number: 10/761,356

Reply to Office Action dated 23 February 2005

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

David I. Klein

Registration #33,253

20 May 2005

Suite 101 3458 Ellicott Center Drive Ellicott City, MD 21043 (410) 465-6678